

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

### **Status of Claims**

Claims 1-3, 5-17 and 19-28 are pending. Claims 1 and 15 are currently amended. Claims 4 and 18 are cancelled.

### **Formal Matters**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to the Abstract.

### **Rejection of claims 1-28 under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Marshall et al (US 5,502,504)**

According to 35 USC § 102, each and every element of a claim must be anticipated, expressly or inherently, by the reference. In this case, Marshall does anticipate the claims because Marshall does not disclose, teach or suggest, expressly or inherently, the claimed features.

Marshall discloses a system that is interactively controlled by a TV viewer remote control transmitter and displays a scroll program guide superimposed on the normal programming displayed on any channel accessible to the viewer's display screen. The tuner receives TV radio frequency or optical transmission signals of any selected channel in response to one of the control signals from the TV viewer remote control transmitter (see Summary section). A signal combiner combines the signal of any channel from the tuner with the output picture image to provide a display signal with the program guide display superimposed over the channel programming display for input to the viewer's display screen. See col 1, lines 34-55. Furthermore, Marshall is concerned with interactive video communications with usable signals of any selected channel in response to control signal from remote control (col 1, lines 34-58) and requires a continuous feed of signals 25 input to the tuner 17 from the cable source (for example, co-axial cable, over-the-air radio frequencies or fiber optics). Marshall merely suggests that transparency may be controlled regardless of any selection.

In contrast, Marshall does not disclose, teach or suggest *when a classification of registration information is selected, registration information corresponding to the selected classification of registration information is displayed as an opaque portion*, as recited in the claim 1. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

• Appl. No. 10/630,711  
Reply to Office Action of November 19, 2007  
Response filed January 22, 2008

Claim 15 is allowable at least for reasons similar to claim 1.

Claims 2, 3 and 5-14 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable base  
claim 1.

Claims 16, 17 and 19-28 are allowable at least because they depend from allowable  
base claim 15.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the above, it is believed that the above-identified application is in condition  
for allowance, and notice to that effect is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner have  
any questions, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone  
number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Gautam Sain  
Reg. No. 57,805

Date: January 22, 2008

Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P.  
1300 19<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W., Suite 600  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2680  
Main: (202) 659-9076